

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. Т	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,878	•	03/24/2004	Michael Martindale	MAR-2.001	6644
22874	7590	03/09/2006		EXAMINER	
GANZ LAW, P.C.				ROY, ANURADHA	
P O BOX 2200 HILLSBORO, OR 97123				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3736	
			DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I.Claims 1-10, drawn to a foot assessment device, class 33, subclass 511.
- II. Claim 11, drawn to a method of assessing the amount of pronation in a foot class 600, subclass 592.
- III. Claim 12, drawn to a method of assessing the amount of pronation in a foot with a marker, class 600, subclass 592.
- IV. Claim 13 & 15-18, drawn to a method of assessing the amount of pronation in a foot with a template, class 600, subclass 592.
- V. Claim 14 & 19-20, drawn to a method of selecting footwear, class 33, subclass 3R.
- VI. Claims 21-23, drawn to a device for assessing pronation comprising a marker, light source, and processor, class 600, subclass 595.

The inventions are distinct because of the following reason:

Inventions I and VI are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention VI has separate utility such as the using a light source and processor for calculating the amount of pronation. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Inventions I or VI and II, III, IV, V, & VI are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, each of the methods is distinct from each other because each exhibits a materially different process of using the claimed foot assessment device.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Bradley Ganz on February 10, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of a **single group** of invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the

Application/Control Number: 10/808,878

Art Unit: 3736

reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anuradha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-6169 and whose email address is anuradha.roy@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached between 8:00am and 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571-272-4726.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Application/Control Number: 10/808,878

Art Unit: 3736

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

~AR~

Mt Hundrey

Page 5